

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 21, 2009, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 28-40 and 53-62 are currently pending. By this Amendment, Claim 28 has been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103

Claims 28-32, 36-38, 40 and 53-62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,185,274 to Rubin et al. (Rubin). Claims 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,965,819 to Kannes (Kannes); Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rubin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,208,745 to Quentin et al. ("Quentin"); Claims 28-31, 36, 38, 40, and 53-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,204,947 to Bernstein et al. ("Bernstein") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,141 to Bezos et al. ("Bezos"); Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernstein in view of Bezos as applied to Claim 28, and further in view of WO 91/11769 to Woodill ("Woodill"); Claims 33-35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernstein in view of Bezos as applied to Claim 28, and further in view of Kannes; and Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernstein in view of Bezos as applied to Claim 28, and further in view of Quentin. To the extent the rejection remains

applicable to the claims as amended, the Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reason(s).

The Applicants submit that Rubin does not disclose or suggest an electronic book, including at least the following combination of features: "at least one first component with at least one underlying link, wherein, upon selection of the at least one first component, the at least one first component links to at least an Internet web site for providing a plurality of streaming video, audio and text data when connected to the electronic book, wherein location information for each of the plurality of streaming video, audio and text data is provided in at least one hidden links table and the at least one hidden links table is provided in conjunction with downloading the content of the electronic book from a remote provider, and each of the at least one hidden links table is associated with the at least one first component with the at least one underlying link, and wherein the location information provides access to the plurality of streaming video, audio and text data, and wherein the at least one first component is a part of a content of the electronic book . . . [and] wherein the hidden links table is updatable from a most current links table using information transmitted via the Internet web site from the remote provider, wherein the most current links table is downloaded to the electronic book either periodically by the remote provider, or when a new electronic book content is downloaded to the electronic book by the remote provider," as recited in amended claim 28.

The Office Action, on page 3, asserts that Rubin, citing to col. 7, lines 45-67 and col. 21, line 51-col. 22, line 9, discloses "wherein the hidden links table is updated from

a most current links table using information transmitted via the Internet web site from the remote provider,” as recited in claim 28.

Rubin, in the Abstract and col. 7, lines 45-67, discloses “a user interface architecture wherein user content and [the] user interface are composed of documents with links” and “when a user performs a navigation action, a record is created of where the user navigated to.” However, Rubin does not disclose or suggest “wherein the hidden links table is updated from a most current links table using information transmitted via the Internet web site from the remote provider,” as recited in amended claim 28.

Instead, Rubin discloses, in col. 7, lines 55-56, a “history map view is a generalization of the linear history provided by prior art browsers . . . [making] it easy for a user to revisit a place the user visited previously.” A “history map view” of “where the user navigated to,” as disclosed in the cited portions of Rubin, may not be interpreted to disclose or suggest updating the hidden links table “from a most current links table using information transmitted via the Internet web site from the remote provider,” as recited in claim 28. Moreover, categorizing the user’s navigation actions in “groupings like web sites or other user tasks,” as disclosed in Rubin, col. 21, lines 65-67, may not be interpreted to disclose or suggest updating the hidden links table “from a most current links table using information transmitted via the Internet web site from the remote provider,” as recited in amended claim 28.

In addition, the Office Action, on page 4, asserts that Rubin discloses “wherein the most current links table is downloaded to the electronic book either periodically by the remote provider . . . or when a new electronic book content is downloaded to the

electronic book by the remote provider” citing to Rubin Fig. 5, element 512 and col. 6, lines 1-4. The Applicants respectfully disagrees with this assertion.

Rubin, in col. 6, lines 1-4, discloses that “the model naturally accommodates dynamic content including downloaded content, that mixes content and UI on the same page as part of a network of related pages.” However, “naturally accommodat[ing] dynamic content including downloaded content” may not be interpreted to disclose or suggest “wherein the most current links table is downloaded to the electronic book,” as recited in amended claim 28. Moreover, Rubin illustrates, in Fig. 5, element 512, a display with the phrase “Today’s Headlines.” A display with the phrase “Today’s Headlines” may not be interpreted to disclose or suggest “wherein the most current links table is downloaded to the electronic book either periodically by the remote provider, or when a new electronic book content is downloaded to the electronic book by the remote provider,” as recited in amended claim 28.

Furthermore, the Applicants submit that Bernstein and Bezos, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest an electronic book, including at least the following combination of features: “at least one first component with at least one underlying link, wherein, upon selection of the at least one first component, the at least one first component links to at least an Internet web site for providing a plurality of streaming video, audio and text data when connected to the electronic book, wherein location information for each of the plurality of streaming video, audio and text data is provided in at least one hidden links table and the at least one hidden links table is provided in conjunction with downloading the content of the electronic book from a remote provider, and each of the at least one hidden links table is associated with the at

least one first component with the at least one underlying link, and wherein the location information provides access to the plurality of streaming video, audio and text data, and wherein the at least one first component is a part of a content of the electronic book . . . [and] wherein the hidden links table is updatable from a most current links table using information transmitted via the Internet web site from the remote provider, wherein the most current links table is downloaded to the electronic book either periodically by the remote provider, or when a new electronic book content is downloaded to the electronic book by the remote provider,” as recited in amended claim 28.

The Office Action, on page 11, asserts that Bezos discloses that “the hidden table is updated from a most recent current links table using information transmitted via the Internet website” citing to Figs. 4 and 8 of Bezos. The Applicants respectfully disagree with this assertion.

Bezos, in col. 11, lines 1-9, discloses that Fig. 4 “illustrates a preferred format of a URL 400 used by an associate to create a referral link to the merchant Web site. . . [where the] URL 400 comprises the merchant Web Server information 402, [and] the unique product ID 404.” However, a URL link with “the merchant Web Server information” and “the unique product ID” may not be interpreted to disclose “the hidden links table is updated from a most current links table using information transmitted via the Internet web site from the remote provider,” as recited in amended claim 28. Moreover, having an associate create “a referral link to the merchant Web site,” may not be interpreted to disclose that “the hidden links table is updated from a most current links table,” as recited in amended claim 28.

Bezos, in Fig. 8 and col. 14, line 63- col. 15, line 16, discloses “an example

HTML catalog document. . . corresponding to the product detail page” where “the product detail page 136 is shown with the URL passed to the customer Web browser 112 from the merchant Web server.” However, a “URL passed to the customer Web browser” from the “merchant Web server” may not be interpreted to disclose that “the hidden links table is updated from a most current links table,” as recited in amended claim 28.

Kannes, Quentin, Bernstein, and Woodill fail to disclose the above features, and therefore, fail to cure the above noted deficiencies of Rubin and Bezos.

For at least the above reasons, the Applicants submit that claim 28 is allowable over the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

As claim 28 is allowable, the Applicants submit that claims 29-40 and 53-62, which depend from allowable claim 28, are therefore also allowable over the cited references, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of claims 28-40 and 53-62, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 01-2300 referencing docket number **026880.00035**.

Respectfully submitted,



Tiffany J. Brooks
Registration No. 57,912

Customer No. 004372

Arent Fox LLP
1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Telephone No. (202) 857-6000
Facsimile No. (202) 857-6395
TJB:elp